

Appl. No. 09/351,086  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 24 August 2005

Page 8 of 10

### REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-2, 4-20, and 26-27 are pending in the application. Claims 3 and 21-25 are canceled herein, and claims 26-27 are newly added.

The Office action rejects claims 1-2, 4-10 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Hjelsvold et al. (USP 6,546,555, hereinafter Hjelsvold).

Amended claim 1, upon which claims 2 and 4-17 depend, claims a method that includes extracting a feature from one or more video segments of a sequence that is displayed on a user's display, determining an association between the feature and at least one additional information source also including that feature; and defining a link between the feature and the at least one additional information source to facilitate a display of information from the additional information source based at least in part on a selection by the user of the feature while the one or more video segments are displayed to the user. Claims 18 and 20 include similar limitations.

Hjelsvold does not teach extracting a feature from video segments of a sequence that is displayed on a user's display and determining an association between the feature and at least one additional information source also including that feature.

Hjelsvold teaches transmitting a hypervideo sequence to a user, and allowing the user to select a hyperlink in the hypervideo to access an additional information source. Of particular note, the hypervideo that is being displayed in Hjelsvold's system includes the hyperlinks; that is, the hyperlinks are predefined within the hypervideo. Hjelsvold does not teach extracting features from a video stream that is displayed on a user's display and subsequently determining an association based on this extracted feature. Hjelsvold teaches determining the associations (hyperlinks) before the video sequence is transmitted to the user, and thus the user is limited to these predetermined associations.

Because Hjelsvold does not teach extracting a feature from video segments of a sequence that is displayed on a user's display and determining an association

Appl. No. 09/351,086  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 24 August 2005

Page 9 of 10

between the feature and at least one additional information source also including that feature, as specifically claimed in claim 1, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-10, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Hjelsvold.

Claim 19 claims an apparatus that includes a processor that determines an association between a feature in video segments and at least one additional information source that also includes the feature, and displays information from the additional information source based at least in part on a selection by a user of the feature while the one or more video segments are displayed to the user.

As noted above, Hjelsvold teaches determining the association/hyperlinks between features in a video before the video is communicated to the user, and thus does not teach an apparatus that provides both the association determination and the user interaction to use this association.

Because Hjelsvold fails to teach a processor that determines an association between a feature in video segments and at least one additional information source that also includes the feature, and displays information from the additional information source based at least in part on a selection by a user of the feature while the one or more video segments are displayed to the user, as specifically claimed in claim 19, , the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Hjelsvold.

The Office action rejects claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hjelsvold and Jain et al. (USP 6,463,444, hereinafter Jain), and claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hjelsvold. The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In each of these rejections, the Office action relies upon Hjelsvold for teaching the elements of claim 1, upon which claims 11-17 depend. As noted above, Hjelsvold does not teach the elements of amended claim 1, and therefore the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of these rejections.

Appl. No. 09/351,086  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 24 August 2005

Page 10 of 10

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Attorney  
Registration Number 41,508  
patents@lawyer.com

1824 Federal Farm Road  
Montross, VA 22520  
Phone: 804-493-0707  
Fax: 215-243-7525